

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re Application of	Atty. Docket
WALTER DEES	US 030450
	Confirmation No. 7058
Serial No. 10/579,158	Group Art Unit: 2175
Filed: MAY 12, 2006	Examiner: ZAHR, A.A.
Title: CONSISTENT USER INTERFACE FRONT END FOR REMOTE USER INTERFACES	

Mail Stop Appeal Brief-Patents
Board of Patent Appeals and Interferences
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

APPELLANT'S REPLY BRIEF

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Answers mailed on February 2,
2010, please consider the following remarks:

REMARKS

Appellant maintains the arguments submitted in the Appeal Brief filed on November 10, 2009 which is incorporated herein by reference. Further, Appellant refutes the allegations made in the Examiner's Answer of February 2, 2010.

In particular, in the Response to Argument section 10, in the paragraph spanning pages 22-23 of the Examiner's Answer of February 2, 2010, column 11, lines 15-20 of U.S. Patent No. 7,027,881 (Yumato) is referred to which specifically recites:

The conversion-into-remote-controller process is a processing sequence performed by the control device and the device to be controlled in cooperation in order that an electronic device serving as a control device is made to function as a remote controller capable of controlling a specific device to be controlled. (Emphasis added)

While the above noted section of Yumato makes the general statement that conversion-into-remote-controller process is a processing sequence performed by both the control device and the device to be controlled, the specific details of the processing sequence for converting the controller into a remote controller reveal that it is "[t]he device to be controlled [that] creates conversion-into-remote-controller data on the basis of this ability information and transmits the data to the control device," where

"ABILITY information indicating the ability of an input operation function of the control device is transmitted from the control device to the device to be controlled." (Abstract, lines 8-11 and lines 5-8; emphasis added)

Further, as clearly shown in Step S114 of FIG 6, and described on column 13, line 58 to column 14, line 3 of Yumato, it is the device to be controlled or "the audio component device 2 [that] performs the process of step S114. Step S114 is a process for creating conversion-into-remote-controller data on the basis of the analysis result in step S113 described above." (Yumato, column 13, line 66 to column 14, line 3; emphasis added)

Accordingly, it is clear that in Yumato, that it is the device to be controlled or audio component device 2, and NOT the control device or cellular phone 1, that creates conversion-into-remote-controller data on the basis of the ability information of the cellular phone 1. The device to be controlled 2 then transmits the conversion-into-remote-controller data to the control device/cell phone 1. Then, the control device/cell phone 1 creates a graphical user interface (GUI) by using the received conversion-into-remote-controller data. As a result, the control device/cell phone 1 can function as a remote controller which remotely controls a specific

device to be controlled 2. Accordingly, it is very clear that in Yumato, the device to be controlled or audio component device 2 creates conversion-into-remote-controller data, and the control device/cell phone 1 merely creates a GUI, without any mapping of one item into another.

In stark contrast, the present invention as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 22, amongst other patentable elements recites (illustrative emphasis provided):

mapping the RUI [of the at least one network device] to the CUI by the control device.

Mapping an RUI to a CUI by the control device is nowhere disclosed or suggested in Yumato. In fact, Yumato is completely silent about any mapping, and merely creates a GUI from conversion data received from the device to be controlled. Even if it is assumed, arguendo, that conversion is analogous to mapping, such mapping or conversion is performed by the device to be controlled in Yumato, and NOT by the control device.

Further, as correctly noted by the Examiner, Yumato is completely silent about any synonyms. U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0154161 (Friedman) is cited in an attempt to

remedy the deficiencies in Yumato.

Friedman is directed to creating a universal console (UC) 200 platform for a UC device 200 where canonical user interface (UI) description is used. Even if it is assumed, arguendo, that such a canonical description is analogous to a synonym used to replace the RUI (which is not the case as discussed below), as recited in independent claims 1 and 22 of the present application, in Friedman "the device or application to be controlled sends a canonical user interface (UI) description of *its* UI to the UC 200." (Friedman, paragraph [0029], lines 10-12; emphasis added) Further, "[f]rom the canonical UI representation, the UC device 200 is capable of recognizing both the action-commands." (Friedman, paragraph [0030], lines 1-3; emphasis added) Thus, any universal remote control user interface in Friedman is created by the UC 200 using canonical UI representation received from the device to be controlled.

By contrast, synonyms that replace parts of the RUI are included in a synonym database, as recited in independent claims 1 and 22 of the present application, and not received from the very same device to be controlled, where the CUI includes the synonym instead of its match in the RUI.

There is simply no disclosure or suggestion in Yumato, Friedman, and combination thereof, of mapping the RUI to the CUI by the control device by replacing the RUI with a synonym that matches the RUI," as recited in independent claim 1, and similarly recited in independent claim 22. (Illustrative emphasis provided) The Friedman UC 200 does not replace anything, but simply uses the canonical UI representation itself provided by the device to be controlled, where such canonical UI representation is NOT any synonym to anything, but is basically the UI itself of the device to be controlled. And even if the canonical UI representation includes synonyms, the Friedman UC 200 merely uses the 'RUI' or the canonical UI representation provided by the device to be controlled, without any replacement of any synonyms.

Accordingly, the allegation in the last full paragraph on page 24 of the Examiner's Answer is strongly disputed, and no synonyms are used in the interfaces disclosed by Yumato and Friedman. Rather, the canonical UI representation of the very same device to be controlled is used, as disclosed in Friedman, and NOT any synonyms to any UI of the device to be controlled.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that independent claims 1 and 22 are allowable, and allowance thereof is

respectfully requested. In addition, it is respectfully submitted that claims 2-21 and 23-31 should also be allowed at least based on their dependence from independent claims 1 and 22.


In addition, Appellant denies any statement, position or averment of the Examiner that is not specifically addressed by the foregoing argument and response. Any rejections and/or points of argument not addressed would appear to be moot in view of the presented remarks. However, Appellant reserves the right to submit further arguments in support of the above stated position, should that become necessary. No arguments are waived and none of the Examiner's statements are conceded.

CONCLUSION

Claims 1-31 are patentable over Yumato and Friedman.

Thus, the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-31 should be reversed.

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Dicran Halajian, Reg. 39,703
Attorney for Appellant
March 15, 2010

THORNE & HALAJIAN, LLP
Applied Technology Center
111 West Main Street
Bay Shore, NY 11706
Tel: (631) 665-5139
Fax: (631) 665-5101